

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 19-20 have been newly added herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to arrange a mutually convenient time to conduct a telephone interview prior to the Examiner again acting on the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that there appears to be a technical misunderstanding regarding (i) output power control of a light source; and (ii) tracking/focus control of a light source.

Briefly speaking, the invention of claims 1 and 10 relates to driving the light source so as to emit the light at an output power which equals a target value (i.e., output power control). *Yoshimoto et al.*, on the other hand, describes controlling the position and/or focus of the light source so as to achieve a desired minimum error value (i.e., tracking error control and/or focus error control). Applicants respectfully submit that such tracking and focus control are completely different from the output power control of the present invention. It is unclear to the applicants how or why the Examiner interprets the teachings of Yoshimoto et al. (e.g., referring to the control of the driving current for the actuator 48) to constitute control of the output power of the light source. The actuator 48 controls the tracking and focus position of the light source, not the output power of the light source.

Although applicants do not believe it necessary, claims 19 and 20 have been added to emphasize further the clear differences in relevant part. Support for claims 19-20 is found, for example, in the present application at page 25, line 17 to page 26, line 6.

Applicants request the above telephone interview in the hope that applicants and the Examiner may better understand each others position and thereby facilitate prompt and favorable prosecution.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 10 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1 and 10 remain rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Yoshimoto et al.* Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

As previously argued by the applicants, the light source driving section of the claimed invention drives a light source based on the second signal so as to emit the light at an output power which equals a target value. In the event an amplitude fluctuation amount of the second signal exceeds a predetermined value, on the other hand, the amplitude fluctuation detection section changes driving characteristics of the light source driving section which serves to drive the light source so as to emit the light at an output power which equals a target value. As exemplified in the specification, the driving characteristics that may be changed include the current for driving the light source, the modulation frequency, the oscillation power, and the like. (Spec., p. 26, Ins. 10-17).

For reasons explained more fully below, *Yoshimoto et al.* does not teach or suggest an apparatus or method as recited in claims 1 and 10. *Yoshimoto et al.* describes an optical disk drive which automatically adjusts the offset values in a servo circuit for focusing and tracking controls. *Thus, Yoshimoto et al. is concerned with providing positional control of the light beam, such as focusing and tracking, and does not teach or suggest changing driving characteristics associated with the output power control of the light source.* That is, *Yoshimoto et al.* fails to teach or suggest the light source driving section as claimed.




Fig. 1(a)

Yoshimoto et al.

In rejecting claims 1 and 10, the Examiner refers to Fig. 1(a) (reproduced herein) and column 12, lines 54-64 of *Yoshimoto et al.* Specifically, the Examiner refers to *Yoshimoto et al.* as teaching the recited amplitude fluctuation detection section. However, *Yoshimoto et al.* relates to techniques for controlling the beam position (tracking) and focus in an optical drive. The section cited by the Examiner refers to providing tracking control based on the detected tracking signal determined by the differential amplifier 40. Based on the tracking signals, the driving current of the actuator 48 is changed so as to adjust the position of the movable optical head portion 16.

Notably, the *Yoshimoto et al.* is not concerned with adjusting or controlling the output power of the light source (light emitting device) 20. As shown in Fig. 1(a), there is no feedback control shown with regard to controlling the output power of the light source. Accordingly, *Yoshimoto et al.* does not teach or suggest an *amplitude fluctuation detection section which changes the driving characteristics of the light source driving section, wherein the light source driving section is driving the output power of the light source.*

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that *Yoshimoto et al.* neither teaches nor renders obvious the invention as recited in claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-9 AND 11-18 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Remaining claims 2-9 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Yoshimoto et al.* in view of *Nakamura et al.* and/or *Miyazaki et al.* Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that claims 2-9 and 11-18 depend from either claim 1 or 10, and may be distinguished over the teachings of *Yoshimoto et al.* for at least the same reasons discussed above. Moreover, neither *Nakamura et al.* nor *Miyazaki et al.* is found to make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Yoshimoto et al.*

IV. NEW CLAIMS 19 AND 20

New claim 19 expressly recites how focus and tracking control is carried out separate and apart from the recited output power control. Claim 20 expressly recites that it is the current of the laser itself which is modulated. *Yoshimoto et al.* nor the secondary references teach or suggest such an apparatus as claimed.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-20 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: March 6, 2009

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113